

DISCONTENT

"MOTHER OF PROGRESS"

Entered at the Postoffice at Lakebay, Wash., as Second Class Matter.

VOL. II. NO. 13.

LAKEBAY, WASH., WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 30, 1899.

WHOLE NO. 65.

ANARCHY.

Anarchy means, as I understand it, equal freedom—non invasion—which is not incompatible with voluntary Communism that I can see. If a number of Anarchists volunteer to form a community of mutualists, whose freedom do they invade? There are many who would voluntarily do so. There are some, I judge by my own feelings, who cannot feel the sentiment of MINE OR THINE. Yet such people are very careful to avoid taking more of a common dish than another. We call that feeling, or sentiment, altruism in contradistinction to an egoism that would appropriate all if it could. Where there is an abundance for all, as there would be in Anarchism, there would be no desire, even if custom permitted it, for one to take more than another.

One of the beauties of Anarchism would be the elimination of fully half of the industries now necessary, as useless. More than half the printing now done is for advertisements. Nearly all the clerks and bookkeepers would become producers. Less than half the labor now employed would produce as much of the necessities and the useful luxuries as we now have. To turn the now industrious persons who would not be needed in free society, and the now idle who desire to produce, into producers two or three hours of productive labor would be all that would be needed. What is now irksome labor would be recreation and sought as a privilege. It would be so conventional to produce in some vocation that no one could withstand the odium of society by continuous idleness. Why there would be any necessity for owning exclusively anything except personal keepsakes or pictures that no one else would prize, I cannot see. It is my opinion that mutualism or Communism would naturally result from Anarchy. Indeed, I see no use in wasting words in discussing Communism, pro nor con.

We want to convert the world to the sublime beauties of Anarchism and whatever may be our individual views of egoism, altruism, Communism, they are not essential; but there are some effects that will result from Anarchism that appeal to the better reason and emotions of the best people that should be kept before the people.

The great objection to Anarchy in the minds of the masses, is the imagined dire results that would follow. They cannot meet the principles upon which Anarchy is founded, but it is the inexpediency of it they dread. The same arguments are brought against Anarchy now that were brought against the doctrine of Universalism fifty years ago, when I was a boy. My mother and aunt, Esther Lee, were the nucleus of what is and has been a strong Universalist church in the country in southern Indiana, five miles from any town. Notwithstanding the Universalists were the best citizens, against whose characters

nothing could be said, yet it was urged, as an argument, that if every one believed that all would be saved in heaven, and there was no hell to deter people, they would plunge into the most reckless crimes imaginable. My mother used to argue that people were not depraved, that a belief in one universal father and one brotherhood of the race would make people better. Nearly everyone in five miles belongs to that church now, and it is an exemplary neighborhood, as the people are intelligent and of moral character.

Objectors to Anarchy tell us the principles are all right, but it won't work until people are perfect. They are like the old woman in the song:

"O, mother, may I go out to swim?
O yes, my darling daughter;
Hang your clothes on a hickory limb
But don't go near the water."

They never think that it is as necessary to have perfect conditions to produce perfect people as it is to have water in which to learn to swim.

Let us show up the invasiveness of government and the moral effects of freedom.

At present we know that the best people, the wisest and most intelligent, for the reason they are in the minority, have no voice in government, and where government is depended on to regulate conduct, moral force is ignored as unnecessary. But in free society, deportment, character and intelligence would be more depended on as examples to lead in the conventionalities of society. All would see the necessity of good example and moral suasion, and the more intelligent would be the more decorous and circumspect in their deportment before the weak minds as examples.

I like, as an argument for Anarchy, to show how conventional, imitative and fond of approbation man is, especially the lowest classes, but I will reserve it for a future letter. J. C. BARNES.
Hindsboro, Ill.

WHO CARES?

Who cares whether or not I am able to think? If I do, or do not, it has nothing to do with the question at issue between Mr. Smith and myself, which is, the economic value of the works of P. J. Proudhon. Does it tend to establish that value to make faces at and misrepresent me? If so, Mr. Smith may be a thinker, as he claims; but to one who is unable to think the case is not clear. If I do not think, it ought to be all the easier for him to refute my arguments; but, just as in his previous letter, he ignores or dodges every point I make and tries to shift the ground.

I objected to an "appeal to authority to settle a question of opinion"; but Mr. S., by way of reply, insists that questions of FACT can be settled by authority and takes more than a half column to prove it, a thing I never questioned. Does Mr. S. know the difference between a fact and an opinion?

According to Mr. Smith's own showing, Proudhon's conception of Communism was taken from Plato's republic, a fiction of 2,000 years ago, when he might have studied forms of Communism in practice in his own day. He also misrepresented the early Christian church when he said that its Communism did not last the first century out. On the other hand, its Communism was its one conspicuous characteristic for nearly 800 years. For this it underwent every persecution which aimed to destroy it. It was only under Charlemagne, in the eighth century, when Christianity was made the official religion, that the church was diverted from its early faith and the practice of Communism. I also pointed out that Proudhon ought to have informed himself about the character and practices of the monastic orders instead of misrepresenting them as he did. He would have found that they constituted so many efforts on the part of Christians to return to the principles and practices of the early church—that they were really revolts against the corruptions of the church, which had resulted from its departure from the teachings of Jesus and the practice of Communism. It cuts no figure that they themselves afterward became corrupted, when they acquired wealth and power. For centuries they were among the most democratic institutions that the world has ever seen. Who cares for the opinions of a man whose opinions are made up with as little regard to the facts? Proudhon's idea of liberty was likely to be as distorted as his idea of Communism; and who cares whether he was willing to trust it or not? He may have obtained it in the same way. Mr. Smith says that Proudhon "never invented any paradoxes." It doesn't matter whether he invented them or not; but he wrote lots of them. He may have copied them from other people for all I know. Mr. Smith is the only one of his admirers, that I know of, who does not freely admit that his works are full of them. We all know plenty of men without an idea of their own, but who have an endless flow of words. They appropriate the ideas of others without regard to coherence or agreement; and never discover that they are often contradictory. There has been altogether too much fuss made over this bombastic Frenchman, may be for the purpose of advertising the works of B. F. Tucker. Why did not Mr. Smith stick to the question at issue—the value of the works of Mr. Proudhon instead of flying off to those of Bacounin and others, which were not under discussion? Was it not a palpable effort to reinforce an appeal to a doubtful authority on a question of opinion with a like appeal to an authority which he hoped would prove better? Again, if Mr. Smith will misrepresent me, and run the risk of exposure, is he any the less likely to misrepresent Bacounin where the chances of exposure are considerably less? He says: "Mr. Van Ornum in-

sists that his is the 'only genuine' brand of libertarian doctrine," and puts only genuine in quotations as if repeating my words; which is unqualifiedly untrue. Neither Mr. Smith, nor anyone else, can show a line of mine like that, or which means it or anything approximating it. The term, even, of "libertarian," is a clumsy, uneuphonic word, which I never use. I presume it is the coinage, and I am willing it should remain the property, of the Tuckerites. Nor did I ever tell in any article of mine "that individual freedom is impossible." I don't believe in any such doctrine and never wrote it, although Mr. Smith says I have "never written an article to his knowledge" in which I did not teach it. I never said "that it is the duty of society to stand between the individual and want." Let Mr. Smith look up what I did say, and quote it as I said it, and he will find it quite another thing; and then it will be more honest. He says, too: "Mr. Van Ornum would gladly hang a king to suppress collective government," which is just as false as his other statements. I don't believe in hanging anybody. Hanging kings does not abolish murder any more than hanging murderers prevents murder. I don't like to characterize, by its ordinary name, this attempt to place me in a wrong light. It wouldn't be polite. It may be as well to call it a Tuckerism, because it is the method practiced by this school, with the editorial approval of Mr. Tucker himself. This is not the first time it has been tried on me; but who cares for the statements of people who depend upon methods like that to gain their ends? Mr. Smith has placed himself outside the pale of legitimate discussion. There are two things requisite to all discussion—one of them is courtesy, and the other truthfulness. He has demonstrated his want of either, and henceforth nothing he can say will be entitled to any consideration whatever. Any discussion with people like that is a pure waste of time, and henceforth I shall decline to notice anything from him, not because I care for his misrepresentations, but because I have something more important to do.

W. H. VAN ORNUM.

The world is blessed with fathers. The "little father" of all the Russias; the "great father" at Washington; the "holy father" at Rome; and the "almighty father" in heaven are a quartette of bilks and imposters robbing and humbugging and pulling the wool over the eyes of the poor mortals in one way or another. Yet one single humbug mother is doing more mischief than all these fathers combined, for the strongest power in the world today is Mother Grundy. S. D., in Free Society.

The present-day theory of success is based on the ability to take something from others. It ought to be based on mutual help to each other, instead of mutual robbery.—Pueblo Courier.

DISCONTENT

"MOTHER OF PROGRESS".

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT LAKEBAY, WASH.

50 CENTS A YEAR

Address all communications to DISCONTENT,
Lakebay, Wash.Make all money orders payable on TACOMA,
Wash.

ETHICS DISCUSSED.

In No. 62 of DISCONTENT is a reply to my criticism of Comrade James' reply to a former article. In it he intimates a willingness to discuss certain propositions with me. In answer I will offer a brief response to his proposal.

In all discussions we must recognize but one guide—TRUTH. The great difficulty we encounter in this work is the vague and indefinite meaning of the words we are compelled to employ. In mathematics and physics we could not take a single step in our investigation were the technical terms employed in them as ambiguous and indefinite as they are in mental science, so called.

I recognize two distinct domains in the realm of nature, in common parlance, matter and mind, though we cannot draw a line of distinction, but we cannot proceed in our inquiries without the distinction, because all our conceptions are expressed terms of matter and mind. It is not a question of origin but of fact with which we must deal. That which presents itself to consciousness carries with it its own proof. The sum of three and four is seven; we cannot prove that; it is itself proof. Three and four are definite terms, otherwise they would be of no value. So with all words that are technically employed. Unless we can attach some clear and definite meaning to the terms in ethical science which we both can accept, it would be folly to attempt to discuss it. Unfortunately, we have no such terms, and our inquiry must turn to a common definition. In this article I shall examine his definitions in his subdivisions and define my own terms.

(1) What is man? (2) What is instinct? What is desire? (3) What is egoism? (4) What is subjective? What is objective? (5) What is the law of human conduct? (6) What is automatic action? (7) What are the motives which induce men to act? These subdivisions will answer our present purpose.

1. Comrade James' definition of man—"a mass of mineral compounds"—is quite different from my conception of him. Man has been the subject of investigation for thousands of years, and now to think he is only "a mass of mineral compounds" will hardly be accepted. The definition is insufficient. It is hardly conceivable that a mass of mineral compounds could produce the wonderful results achieved by human agency.

2. He thinks instinct and desire "are due to chemical reaction. As chemistry exhibits no such attributes as pertain to human nature, it seems absurd to ascribe them to chemical reaction. Instinct may be defined as the operation of a principle of organized life by the exercise of certain natural powers directed to the present or future good of the individual—a disposition to act without deliberation or experience or end in view. Desire is the persistent, conscious longing for satisfaction, for

enjoyment—happiness. It is the primal source of all activities.

3. Ego is the I AM, the ESSE, the MAN, not his body which is a "mass of mineral compounds." "Where shall we bury you?" asked Crito of Socrates, when he was dying. "Wherever you can catch me," was the reply; "but as to my body wherever you please." The times are replete with evidence of the survival of the ego after the dissolution of the body. The consideration of the ego, then, takes us into the realm of mind. Man is the repository of infinite possibilities, and destined to eternal progress.

4. The subjective is that which goes out from the man; the objective is what comes to him. He acts and is acted upon; he lives and moves in both the subjective and objective realms. Comrade James is right when he says "the only rational view of things in general points to a spiritual first cause (a god) and a spiritual life everlasting (the immortal soul)." Here we stand on the same ground. The word "soul" being synonymous with man. "Subjectivity applies to those states of thought and feeling of which the mind is subject opposed to objective which is applied to things separate from the mind, and as objects of its attention. The subjective truth or reality is that which is verified by consciousness; objective truth or reality is that which results from the nature and relation of things. A subjective motive is an internal feeling or propensity; an objective motive is something external to the mind which is suited to awaken desire. Subjective views are those which are produced or modified by internal feeling; objective views are those which are governed by the consideration of external objects." (American Cyclopaedia.) Since all human interests culminate in what we do, or do not do, the matter of doing or not doing is the most important of all matters. This matter of doing or not doing we call ethics.

5. The fundamental law of human conduct is expressed in one general formula: Man pursues along the line of least resistance those interests which he thinks will best satisfy his desires, and promote his welfare, present and future; and he avoids the evils which he fears may cause him pain or misery as best he can. This is the law regarding voluntary conduct. Sometimes, however, the intensity of desire or passion overrides all considerations of welfare, in consequence of which man falls a victim to his desire or passion. The strongest feeling determines the act, whatever it may be.

6. Those acts which are purely automatic are extremely rare; volition is hidden by its extreme rapidity. By the continued repetition of an act, for a sufficient length of time, it becomes so easy to perform that we do not notice the action. At first the act was performed consciously and with difficulty. Were all acts to continue so life itself would be intolerable. A lawyer of 30 years' practice will conduct a case which, if the same skill were required and labor were performed when he had but six months' practice, it would have driven him crazy.

7. I think Comrade James' insistence that there are deliberate and intentional self tormentors for the sake of enjoying the torment, does not need much com-

ment. Such would be contrary to the fundamental law of human conduct. We do not often find men hunting after torment; if we do, we put them in the lunatic asylum. The obstinate slave who will not submit prefers the flogging, and would unto death, if pushed to that extremity, rather than submit. Although he does not do as he pleases, he takes the choice of alternatives, dictated by his feelings. I see no *reductio ad absurdum* here.

I am not a slave to theory. I do not deal in theories. The basis of ethics rests upon a foundation as firm and solid as is that of mathematics or physics. No one can deny that innate in man are the springs of action—the desire for enjoyment or the longing for its satisfaction. All that men obtain or seek to obtain, all that men do or seek to do, all that men avoid or seek to avoid, is for the sole purpose of satisfying some desire—of gratifying some feeling. Is that a theory? The character of human conduct is determined by that of the feeling, or feelings, that gave rise to it. In other words, the conduct is the expression of the feelings. Is that a theory? The intellect serves to devise ways and means for the satisfaction of desire, for the gratification of feeling without any regard whatever to the character of the feeling. There is no moral element in intellect. It serves a bad feeling as readily and efficiently as a good feeling. Is that a theory? I must not enlarge upon this subject. The world is cursed with theories. They blind, mislead and enslave.

There are four departments of science (outside of mathematics) founded on the four kinds of force manifested in nature. Unsupported bodies fall to the ground in obedience to a force (gravity); oxygen and hydrogen unite to form water in obedience to a force (chemical affinity); some forms of matter are organized into living bodies in obedience to a force (vital force); feeling gives rise to human conduct in obedience to a force (the psychic force). These forces are the bases of mechanics, chemistry, biology and ethics, the last of which is still in the embryo.

These forces are all in the same category; all have the same basis on natural law; all (when clearly understood) have the same certainty of action and its results, and all are developed in the same manner. In all of them we trace facts (effects) to their causes, and deduce a principle, an undeviating rule of action, a natural law. These facts we define, formulate and arrange in logical order and system, and call it science. The facts upon which ethics is founded are as evident and substantial as are those of mechanics, chemistry and biology.

E. J. SCHELLHOUS.

THE UNIVERSAL STENCH.

On July 10 the Daily News wrote: "It almost seems as though there is something in the American air, or the American soil, which makes bribery and corruption inevitable in American politics. The shortcomings of the United States in this respect are well known, and, despite the valiant efforts which reformers have been making to remedy them, it is very doubtful if the result has been of any consequence. Now, Canada is rapidly hastening to overtake the ill fame of the states. After every election in the dominion there is a long

tale of petitions, involving both Liberals and Conservatives in disgrace; but for thoroughness of method, the corruption and falsification pursued at West Elgin, Ontario, during an election for the Ontario legislative assembly, can hardly be beaten. The trial has just been held, and it was abruptly concluded by the elected member sending a letter to his opponent, admitting among other things, that certain strange persons were drafted into West Elgin for the election, that they passed themselves off under the names of reputable local men, and acted as deputy returning officers; that numbers of outsiders were brought in to personate qualified voters, that ballot papers were put into the ballot boxes in bunches in favor of one of the candidates, that during the counting the papers had been tampered with, that the results declared were bogus, and that those agents were entertained in the houses of the accredited agents of the elected candidate. There is a magnificent audacity about this which almost makes us forget the criminality of the acts."

Please don't shrug your shoulders, and forget the whole thing because it is Canada. It is not Canada—it is politics that are in question, and on their trial. It is the whole system of power, of taxation, of compulsion that is in question. So long as you choose to make it of the first importance to those who have important interests or hold strong opinions that they should beat their neighbors by bringing a bigger army (real or sham), into the field, and thus get into their hands the power of officially establishing their own opinions or interests, so long you will have the stained and disreputable chronicle that goes with electioneering in all countries. Are we in this country any better? We don't do the thing so coarsely—we wear a thicker veil over our faces—but we are perhaps as unscrupulous. Lord Salisbury, the king of doles, and his government buy anybody who can give them a vote, not only such of the workmen as Mr. Chamberlain can manipulate for him, but jingoes, protectionists, parsons, anybody that they can buy without too deeply offending the rest of their other supporters; while the Liberals more directly lay themselves out to buy the mass of the workmen by special legislation directed against the richer classes. The use of a rich citizen is, according to certain sections of the so-called Liberal party, to be taxed, and thus buy up the poorer citizens at so much a head. Was there ever a meaner and more untruthful business? and all the more ill-savory just because disguised under such fine words. These men of both parties plunge us all into conflict, teach us all to hate and dread each other, acclimatize trick and manoeuvre of every kind amongst us, and at the same time are good enough to ask us to admire them as patriots—consumed with a love of the public good. It is a large order to say the least of it. They might, I think, do the admiring business for themselves, without troubling us in the matter.—Free Life, London.

When the laws governing hereditary transmission shall be thoroughly investigated and fully understood, a tremendous step has been taken in the direction of improving the human family at the germinal point.—Dr. E. B. Foote.

WHY SOCIALISM WOULD DESTROY SOCIETY.

More than anything else, the socialistic conception of perfected society seems to regard it fundamentally as to be developed upon a completely organized machinery of production, in which the individual will be simply a part in the great machine, or, as it were, a cell in some specialized organ of the great human body, and this expectation would appear to imply a misconception of the laws by which the individualized life itself has been established and has been maintained.

The individual lives (as an individual) because he has struggled for existence, adapting himself through the exercise of his faculties to the natural environment. Under the provocation of innate desire he has in the natural environment endeavored to do innumerable things, and success in these endeavors has established his power of doing and really determined the fact of his individuality, which continued endeavor strengthens and preserves. But the indispensable condition of his endeavors was liberty—that is, liberty in the sense of opportunity to try to do what he wanted to, as impelled by his own feelings. In this way he has been preserved not only as an individual, but he has become man, conscious of his own individuality and desiring to continue it.

Now, if this individualized man is deprived of the opportunity of trying to do the things he wants to do of himself, and, by some artificial contrivance of society, is placed in an environment where there is no personal opportunity, and where he is compelled to do the things which some other individual, or individuals, want done, as would be the case were he a cell in some special organ of organized society, it is very apparent that being deprived of all opportunity of spontaneous expression, he would soon lose spontaneous desire, and would in all matters come to instinctively rely for direction upon the forces or wills which he found constantly impelling his activities without reference to what he was impelled to himself.

He would then cease to be an individual—he would become absolutely and only a piece of machinery in a machine—that machine would be society.

Now, unfortunately, this machine—society—is not able to run itself on the principle of perpetual motion, but requires an intelligent guidance which must be supplied by individuals, which has been shown it tends to destroy and has no way of recreating; could the machine run, as is assumed, it would run down from inability to reconstruct its parts as they were worn out—there would be no more men to continue society.

Practically, and in a word, socialistic society would in a few generations become a state of general slavery, controlled by a few minds that had continued to maintain their individuality while suppressing that of others.

From these considerations it would appear that if society is to continue in progressive evolution to stability, that it can only be through freedom, or permitting each part the opportunity of establishing its life as the result of endeavor excited by its own desires and guided by its own intelligence. Modern methods of production by immense ma-

chines in immense shops set themselves against freedom, and, requiring the subordination of masses of individuals under the exact preconceived direction of superiors, suppress the power of self-sustainment in the individual, and developing a painful inequality between those subjected to direction and the directors, threaten another form of dissolution—by revolt. It is indicated that modern civilization must either be destroyed through the slavery, or inequalities, forced by its methods of production or must break up its enormous and complex machines and revert to simpler forms of production by which individuals can maintain themselves by their own exertions, in their own way, and thus preserve individuality, or character—essential to the integrity of the whole society—and which Socialism, following the trend of modern production, would destroy, and lead to decay—yes, the absolute death of society itself.

J. W. G.

THE HUMBUGGED VOTER.

The politician is my shepherd. I shall not want any good thing during the campaign. He leadeth me into the saloon for my vote's sake; he filleth my pockets with good cigars; my glass of beer runneth over. He prepareth my ticket for me in the presence of my better judgment. Yea, though I walk through the mud and rain to vote for him and shout myself hoarse when he is elected, straightway he forgetteth me; lo! when I meet him in his own office he knoweth me not. Surely, the wool has been pulled over my eyes all the days of my life, and I will kick myself forever.

—Ex.

I am in favor of abolition of money as a medium of exchange. Money is the root of all evil. I have failed as yet to find any one who has successfully refuted that statement. Men kill one another for it. Men rob one another for it. Some starve others for it. Men become legal butchers for it. Virtue is sold for it. To prevent these crimes it should be abolished. Such abolition would cause the bloated and soulless individual to howl like a whipped pup. You would think that the life was being malled out of him. It takes away a certain power from him and makes him equal to others of the human family. By what law of nature is one man granted a greater title to this world's goods than another. Is it simply because he may be a little less reckless or that he has had a better opportunity at some time. If a man had a team of horses, one fast and one slow, which would be the most reasonable to constantly use the whip or hold in check the faster one. Such is the attitude of a few senseless creatures who are constantly harping upon the success of others. Consequently the limitation should be used to the benefit of the whole, and individual aggrandizement held in check. An individual ought only to have what he can consume, and then the thing would be equalized. Crime and poverty would be a thing of the past if money was sent to hell. Let us have such a condition and enjoy this world, to let it be what it was designed, a dwelling place for mankind, and not let it remain a hell alike for the rich and poor.—The Crank in The Commoner.

FREE LOVE.

Time was when I had certain philanthropic ideas about relieving the condition of prostitutes, those who have been turned out of your homes and have joined the fallen sisterhood. But we must deal our heaviest blows at that condition of society which makes prostitution possible. All that we can do today is to open the doors of our houses of prostitution and say: "O, sisters, come forth and take your places by the bank directors, the men in the stock exchange and on Wall street, and in your business streets of Chicago; take your places by the ministers in the pulpit, by the pew opener in the church, by the sanctimonious hypocrite who fills the pew, aye, take your place as equal beside the man who visited you last night. I have no sympathy with vice, but right society, and when you have righted society, prostitution will cease, and the houses of prostitution will, with the churches and the priests, the prison and the gallows, be consigned to oblivion, or only preserved as relics of ignorance and darkness and beastial stupidity of the present hour. Never mind what they call you; what does it matter? If they call you a free lover, they couple together two of the divinest words in the English language—freedom, for which our forefathers fought and bled; love, the divinest element in humanity. Free lovers should wear the name or a badge of the legion of honor. I care not what men call me, whether they call me prostitute or chaste, because I have that in my soul that lies so high above the consideration of human approbation or disapproval that no words which you can hurl at me will ever make me less than I am today—the lover of humanity, whose soul is consecrated to the service of the hour, and sworn to work until every man and woman stands free from the miserable bondage of a false educational system.—Laura Cuppy Smith, in The Word, 1873.

MARRIAGE IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Their marriage custom is a most interesting one. A youth in love with a girl first finds out how he stands with the parents of his intended. If all is fair in that quarter he proceeds to take the girl in his arms. She at once breaks loose, however, and runs away. He follows and again catches her. Again she resists and flees from him. This is repeated until the girl, wearied with the play, finally yields. The father of the girl then drags the youth up a rough ladder to the floor of the elevated hut; the mother follows with the daughter. The young people are then made to kneel down and the old man throws a coconut full of water over the pair. He next bumps their heads together and they are considered man and wife. Then they go away together and spend their honeymoon in the mountains, where they remain five days. After this they return to the every day life of the village.—Manila Correspondence.

THE CONSERVATIVE.

The conservatism of the gentlemen who are quite satisfied that society is all right and that reformers are a pestilent or foolish brood, is based on nothing but intense egotism and intense selfishness. Their creed practically amounts to this: "We have good homes, good clothes and

good times; therefore, the world is all that it should be." Added to this egotism and selfishness is frequently a stupid ignorance. It would be irritating, if it were not amusing, to hear the condescending speech in which the conservatives deign to notice the radicals—"well-meaning, but impractical," "cranks," "dreamers"—these are their phrases. And yet nothing is more emphatically proven by all history than this thing—that all the practical progress of mankind has been initiated and accelerated by these "dreamers." And all the progress of the race has been made with the conservatives of each generation hanging on and pulling backward. The conservative, in fact, is the dreamer. He is as useless in the scheme of things as a fifth wheel on a wagon. He lives in the past and can only see backward. The conservative of one generation camps always by the embers of the watch fires which the radicals of the generation before him lighted and left behind. He is always full of the belief that he is the leader of events, when, in truth, the poor dunce is always a day's march behind.—Phil Francis, in S. F. Star.

The word "immorality" naturally implies "not moral," but is almost entirely confined by pharisaical churchmen of the present day to sexual immorality. But if "not moral" be the true meaning of the term, how much more infamous and atrocious must be that immorality which, by robbing men of the fruits of their labor, and by denying them their equal rights in the bounty of nature, creates poverty and destitution, herds human beings into tenements under conditions where morality is practically impossible, and drives girls and women onto the streets to make up, by an infamous traffic, what has been extorted from them by landlordism. In fact, how much more vicious must be the cause of evil than the effect!—Crawford Nunghan, in Melbourne Beacon.

The incommunicado was abolished in Cuba today. Imprisonment incommunicado is, as most people know by this time, imprisonment in seclusion, so that the person is not allowed to communicate with friends or lawyers. Now that that the incommunicado has been abolished in Cuba by the American authorities, would it not be a good thing for the American authorities to abolish it in the United States, where it has never been legal, but where it is quite extensively practiced? In New York, Chicago and San Francisco the police constantly arrest American citizens without warrant, and hold them in secret imprisonment and incommunicado.—Stockton Mail.

Also in Idaho.

Liberty and license get strangely mixed in the minds of many men. Folks are afraid that if liberty were to be granted to all that the vicious would rob and murder without regard to rights of others. Experience teaches that just the reverse is true. The more liberty people have the less they do these vicious acts.—The Independent.

There are people who think their neighbor's houses need painting because they do not wash their own windows.—Ex.

"A PRACTICAL SUGGESTION."

"There ought to be more of them killed." Well! Well! This is social economy with a vengeance. Why not build sausage and soap factories and utilize these wayward wives in the manufacture of bologna and hard soap?

This is a practical suggestion, and has been tried in this country with more or less success—at least, as far as the finished article was concerned. This plan, if carried out to the letter, would not only prove remunerative from a financial point of view, but would be the means of settling a great social problem—viz., ridding society of its noxious weeds. If man is ever to be protected from the evil machinations of his neighbor's wives, it is about time for the public to open its eyes and come to his rescue. The remedy is simple. Let the "hen-pecked" fraternity petition congress to pass two laws for their special benefit. One to lower freight rates on pork and hides (this will secure cheap transportation and can be reduced to a minimum by shipping in job lots). The other a game law, which will guarantee a bounty of so much per head for every scalp taken from delinquent wives. Now organize a secret detective society (for particulars and suggestions see Comstock) empowering its members to bribe, (or in any other legitimate way) tempt the virtue of every woman throughout the country who signs herself wife; and, when one is found who "weakens," collect the (lawful) "fee," then scalp her and ship her in to headquarters and be credited with the commission on the other end of the line; this brokerage, coupled with the original fee, will prove an incentive for idle moralists who are out of a job, and hankering to do something for their country, to join the ring. Far better than shooting Filipinos at \$13 per month.

Soap, being itself an emblem of purity, would if made from this tallow and labeled accordingly command the highest market price possible. Every cuckold in the country would buy this brand in preference to those containing hog lard or dog grease, and the sausage would have a special flavor for this class of customers. Like the head hunters of Borneo, who drink from the skulls of their enemies as a sort of oblation to their deity, so our virtuous husbands could console their consciences, and at the same time clean their skins with soap made from the suet of their fallen wives. Never mind this seeming paradoxical inference; sin, like devils and strichnine, is not supposed to enter or affect grease.

I wonder if the idea ever entered the cranium of this modern Mephistopheles (who would shoot wives to make them honest) that there is an infallible, underlying cause for this wholesale degeneracy of married women (we will say nothing about men, as their right to "forbidden fruit has never yet been questioned). Let me give him a pointer. When a wife is "untrue" and seeks the society of some other man it is a sure sign that her love for her husband is dead and buried, and that she no longer enjoys his society or desires his companionship. This is as true as that the sun rises in the east and sets in the west. Now what are we going to do about it? Compel people (who have neither love

nor respect for each other) by brute force or laws to remain together till death to fight like cats and dogs? Hardly! It seems to me that this shotgun theory has been tested about long enough. Why not free woman at once and let her own and control her own person? This is the only practical solution to this vexed problem, and those who are too blind or balky to recognize this fact will be surprised one of these fine mornings in the near future to wake up and find that every law pertaining to marriage and divorce has been wiped from the statute books, and the slates for the future washed clean. Better save your powder, comrade, and climb onto the band wagon by subscribing for DISCONTENT, or some other Anarchist paper, and "post up" before again going on record as making a jackass of yourself.

THANATOPSIS.

THE RESULT OF POWER.

The letter carriers have been planning a scheme to raise a big fund to secure legislation at the next congress to give them higher salaries. The postal department has put a crimp in the scheme by summarily dismissing two postmasters for soliciting funds for that purpose. Other dismissals are expected.—Tacoma News.

Once more does that department of our government which the State Socialists are wont to point to with pride give evidence of its determination to restrict the natural liberties of those who are laboring in its service.

When power is given it is the natural tendency of those who have been invested with it to consider themselves of much greater importance than those who have conferred upon them authority, and their first care is to keep all others down.

We find today a Republican administration denying the use of the mails to the hostile criticism of the other parties, in order that it may retain its power. Would this tendency stop with suppression of a political criticism—could it help a similar interference with questions belonging purely to the labor and educational world?

And what would be, were the State Socialist party in power, with a program of governmental control stretching so far wider and deeper over all affairs—would we not look for it to use the party lash even more unscrupulously and with more telling effect than is done by the government today.

The people have this thing to learn, that a people who submit their opportunities and actions to governmental regulation will be made slaves. And that individual liberty is the only key that will unlock the great storehouse of progress to the future generations.

O. A. VERITY.

ASSOCIATION NOTES.

C. L. Penhallow and Henry Stocker left for Cosmopolis, Wash., last week, to work.

Gertie Mellinger is the guest of her mother, Mary C. Parker. She may become a resident of our community.

G. F. Smith, who returned from Alaska a few weeks ago, sold his improvements to S. B. Huber, and left for Seattle Monday.

This association is simply a land-holding institution, and can take no part in

the starting of an industry. All industries are inaugurated by the members interested and those willing to help them. Just now we have about 65 people here (men, women and children). Streets are not opened yet and we have no sidewalks. Those thinking of coming here must expect to work, as it is not an easy job to clear this land and get it in shape for cultivation. We are not living communistic as a body; only two families are living that way, but there is nothing in our articles of incorporation and agreement to prohibit any number of persons from living in that manner if AGREEABLE.

Don't ever be guilty of wanting anything, workingmen. It is true that you build the palaces, weave the Wiltons and brussels, manufacture the finest of shoes and clothing, raise the best of foods, and make the earth a paradise for the few wealthy. But you shouldn't want anything for yourselves. Of course, it is plain that you don't, I only mention it for fear that you might get it into your head that since you created all these things you are entitled to something more than the refuse and shanty shelter. That would be Anarchy, and I wish to warn you not only against Anarchy but against all agitators. Agitators are dangerous and are likely to get you into a worse fix than you are now in. Of course, you haven't anything to lose but don't worry about that. Work and be content, for over there the master prepares a house not built with hands, where you can go after you are dead—maybe. There's some little doubt about it, of course, but you should work and hope. Hope is such a hot thing, you know. Don't ever read or think, gent. It wasn't intended that you should, and, as a rule, you are doing just what it was intended that you should. Always be a working mule—its so much fun to pile up wealth all one's life for some one else to enjoy, and then when one dies get one of those half-cent burials, which the undertakers furnish paupers.—Appeal to Reason.

A new machine has been invented, gents. Toss up your hat and yell. It will reduce the surplus of labor—make it easier to get a job. It's a gatling gun, mounted on an automobile, and will be "used to clear the streets of mobs and rioters." And there you are. It's a warm tool, judging by the description. It will shoot in all directions at once—pour forth a leaden storm on "the people." And this is an indication of what your servants think of you, producers. They consider you fit food for bullets and don't wait till you need the grub, either. They prepare in advance. I tell you the plutes are going to run this country and do it with shot and shell. They don't intend to allow you to do anything except work for their benefit. And if you can see nothing in Cour d'Alene and these new guns and the mobilization of troops near large cities, if you are so indifferent to your future that you will neither study nor act, then you will deserve every lash that will be laid on the backs of yourself and your children for all the ages to come. A fool or a coward deserves nothing but what he gets—and that is always the worst of it. Choose your beds, and then lie on them. You have a choice now but you won't have long to dilly dally over what it shall be. Freedom or slavery, which? —Appeal to Reason.

RECEIPTS.

Berger 50c, Barnes 25c, Kinghorn-Jones 25c.

DISCONTENT IS HANDLED BY:

Boston—Columbia Stationery Store 935 Washington st.
Boston—C. A. Sibley, 642 Washington street.

AGENTS FOR DISCONTENT.

San Francisco—L. Nylan, 17 Congo st.
Honolulu—A. Klemencic, Alakea st.

A SPIRIT PHYSICIAN—Teaches how to avoid heredity disease and gives instruction in ways tending to insure the happiness of the family. Price 50 cents. For sale by Lois Walsbrooker, Santa Ana, Calif.

MY CENTURY PLANT—By Lois Walsbrooker—So-called because so much in advance of the time that only thinkers will appreciate. Written under the influence of an adept of old Atlantis. Shows the law of regeneration, of materialization, the root of church power, and how to free the earth of sex disease. A remarkable book. Price \$1. For sale by Lois Walsbrooker, Santa Ana, Calif.

FREEDOM, a monthly journal of Anarchist Communism. Address, 7 Lamb's Conduit St., London, W. C., England. Price 40 cents per year, postpaid.

FREE SOCIETY, an advocate of Anarchist Communism. 50 cents a year. 43 Sheridan street, San Francisco, Calif.

THE EAGLE AND THE SERPENT proclaims the gospel of "Salvation by Selfishness." For sample copy (3c.) write A. Mueller, 108 Clark street, Chicago, Ill.

THE ALTRUIST is a monthly paper, partly in phonetic spelling, and devoted to equal rights, mutual assistance, united labor, and common property. It is issued by the Altruist Community, of St. Louis, whose members hold all their property in common, live and work together in a permanent home for their mutual enjoyment, assistance and support, and both men and women have equal rights and decide on all its business affairs by their majority vote. It now has 3,920 acres of land in Southeast Missouri on which it offers a home and employment for life to all acceptable persons who may wish to join it. 25c a year; specimen copy free. A. Longley, editor, 2319 Olive street, St. Louis, Mo.

Articles of Incorporation and Agreement of the Mutual Home Association.

Be it remembered, that on this 17th day of January, 1898, we, the undersigned, have associated ourselves together for the purpose of forming a corporation under the laws of the State of Washington.

That the name of the corporation shall be The Mutual Home Association.

The purpose of the association is to assist its members in obtaining and building homes for themselves and to aid in establishing better social and moral conditions.

The location of this corporation shall be at Home City, located on Joes Bay, Pierce County, State of Washington; and this association may establish in other places in this state branches of the same where two or more persons may wish to locate.

Any person may become a member of this association by paying into the treasury a sum equal to the cost of the land he or she may select and one dollar for a certificate and subscribing to this agreement.

The affairs of this association shall be conducted by a board of trustees, elected as may be provided by the by laws.

A certificate of membership shall entitle the legal holder to the use and occupancy of not less than one acre of land nor more than two (less all public streets) upon payment annually into the treasury of the association a sum equal to the taxes assessed against the tract of land he or she may hold.

All money received from memberships shall be used only for the purpose of purchasing land. The real estate of this association shall never be sold, mortgaged or disposed of. A unanimous vote of all members of this association shall be required to change these articles of incorporation.

No officer, or other person, shall ever be empowered to contract any debt in the name of this association.

All certificates of membership shall be for life.

Upon the death of any member a certificate of membership shall be issued covering the land described in certificate of membership of deceased:

First: To person named in will or bequest.

Second: Wife or husband.

Third: Children of deceased; if there is more than one child they must decide for themselves.

All improvements upon land covered by certificate of membership shall be personal property, and the association as such has no claim thereto.

Any member has the right of choice of any land not already chosen or set aside for a special purpose.

CERTIFICATE OF MEMBERSHIP.

This is to certify that has subscribed to the articles of incorporation and agreement and paid into the treasury of the Mutual Home Association the sum of . . . dollars, which entitles to the use and occupancy for life of lot . . . block . . . as platted by the association, upon complying with the articles of agreement